DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 378 396 CE 068 061

TITLE	Revising Department of Public Instruction Practices Regarding the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act. A Workshop Report with Recommendations for Improvement. Bulletin No. 95168.
INSTITUTION	Wisconsin State Dept. of Public Instruction, Madison.
PUB DATE	Dec 94
NOTE	28p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Instructional Strategies Team, Wisconsin Dept. of Public Instruction, 125 South Webster Street, P.O. Box 7841, Madison, WI 53707-7841.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Legislation; *Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Government Role; Government School Relationship; *Guidelines; Postsecondary Education; *Program Administration; Program Implementation; Secondary Education; State Programs; Statewide Planning; Student Records; *Vocational Education; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	*Carl D Perkins Voc and Appl Techn Educ Act 1990; Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

This report describes the process, participants, and recommendations for change evolving from a workshop centered on a review of Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) practices relating to the federal Carl Perkins Act. A workshop summary discusses the background, process, and outcomes of the workshop. Highlights are provided from the three groups that deliberated on three broad topical areas: application guidelines, related issues, and the Vocational Education Enrollment Reporting System (VEERS). Other contents include the workshop invitation, workshop agenda and participant list, and breakout team directions, topical issues, and roster. Lists of suggestions for breakout team recommendations follow. The recommendations for the applications guidelines identify 30 specific suggestions for potential changes to the guidelines themselves as well as identification of various issues related to them (e.g., putting the application information on Wisenet, etc.). The related issues recommendations focus on these three issues: Local Vocational Education Coordinators requirement, consortium fiscal practices, and DPI consultant role. The VEERS recommendations relate to four major areas: clarification of definitions, descriptions, and ideas; technical assistance needs; communication between DPI, fiscal agents, and local education authorities; and multiple requests for related data. The report concludes with the workshop evaluation form and summary of evaluation form comments. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Developed by Instructional Strategies Team
Division for Learning Support: Instructional Services
Pauli Nikolay, Assistant State Superintendent

This publication is available from

Instructional Strategies Team
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
125 South Webster Street
P.O. Box 7841
Madison, WI 53707-7841
(800) 441-4563

Bulletin No. 95168

Copyright © 1994 by Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction does not discriminate on the basis of sex, race, religion, age, national origin, ancestry, creed, pregnancy, marital or parental status, sexual orientation or physical, mental, emotional or learning disability.

Printed on recycled paper.

Table of Contents

Title	Page #
Introductory Memo	1
Workshop Summary	2
Workshop Invitation	5
Workshop Agenda and Participant List	7
Breakout Team Directions, Topical Issues and Roster	9
Breakout Team Recommendations	13
Application Guidelines	13
Related Issues	14
VEERS	18
Workshop Evaluation Form and Comments	19

State of Wisconsin
Department of Public Instruction
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 7841, Madison, WI 53707-7841
125 South Webster Street, Madison, WI 53702 (608) 266-3390/(608) 267-2427 TDD

John T. Benson
State Superintendent

Robert H. Gomoll
Deputy State Superintend

DATE: December, 1994

TO: District Administrators, CESA Administrators, Local Vocational Education Coordinators (LVECs) and Local District Carl Perkins Designees

FROM: Pauli Nikolay, Assistant State Superintendent
Division for Learning Support: Instructional Services

SUBJECT: Workshop Report on Revising DPI Carl Perkins Practices

It is a pleasure to forward this report to you describing the process, participants and recommendations for change evolving from a workshop centered on a review of DPI practices relating to the federal Carl Perkins Act. This report represents the first Department effort to systematically work with our "customers" from the field on analyzing, discussing, debating and finally recommending changes in specific Department practices related to one of our major federal programs.

The results of this effort have provided DPI Carl Perkins management and program staff with invaluable information which they have used to make changes in the current system. It also provided insight into issues and ideas the Department has used in making its recommendations to various national groups regarding the Carl Perkins Reauthorization. Finally, the Department is committed to using a similar mechanism on an ongoing basis either to review current practices or to determine best practices for a new Carl Perkins Act.

Please use this report as basic data to consider not only in terms of Department practices, but also as a local process to utilize should you elect to review Carl Perkins practices within your own agencies. Should you have any questions or concerns regarding the contents of this document, please contact either Eunice Bethke (608/267-9275) or Bob Enghagen (608/267-2275) from the Carl Perkins management team within the Department.

Finally, "Thanks" to each of you who assisted the Department in this effort. We look forward to continuing and expanding this type of activity.

cc: John Benson, State Superintendent
Department of Public Instruction

Juanita S. Pawlisch, Assistant State Superintendent
Division for Learning Support: Equity & Advocacy

Workshop Summary

Background

Last summer State Superintendent Benson was asked to review certain Carl Perkins administrative and program requirements. Management staff from the Carl Perkins team met with the CESA Administrators and the Board of Directors of the Wisconsin Association of Secondary Vocational Administration (WASVA) to obtain further input into the issues and possible design of a joint DPI/local practitioner review of Department practices. A workshop design was developed, dates determined and twenty-two local district staff and nine Department staff were invited to participate in a Carl Perkins Practices Review Workshop on the night of October 6th and October 7th, 1994 at the Quality Inn - South in Madison.

Process

Beginning on Thursday night, October 6th, a program was provided to fully inform workshop participants with the myriad and numerous requirements from the Carl Perkins Act, its Rules and Regulations, other federal requirements for education agencies receiving federal grants and the state (e.g. Department) methods of implementation.

On the morning of the 7th, sub-teams deliberated on the following broad topical areas: Application Guidelines, VEERS and Other Related Issues. Each team was provided a set of suggested guidelines and a one-page "fact sheet" highlighting 2-3 specific questions/concerns regarding the general topic area. The first session was spent on identifying and validating a full range of topical concerns and the second morning session was spent problem-solving the issues identified earlier. The afternoon session was designed for all three teams to report out to the whole group with some additional discussion.

Department staff then collected all the information generated by the teams and took it back to the Department for review and incorporation into various aspects of its Carl Perkins operation. This written report was developed for dissemination to participants. It should be noted that all group reports are included verbatim from the written documents generated at the workshop and are included as submitted. Where appropriate, Editor notes are included for clarification.

Outcomes

Twenty-nine different vocational education professional staff spent over 240 hours learning about, discussing and making recommendations for change covering the three major topics. The Department spent approximately $3,200 for

participant expenses, lodging and meals. While the Department may not be able to continue full funding of such activities in the future, other avenues of gaining local participation will be explored as both Department and local staff evaluated the experience as being of significant value for both.

The following information is offered as highlights from each of the groups.

Application Guidelines Team

This group, given the very specific nature of its task was able to identify thirty specific suggestions for potential changes to the Guidelines themselves as well as identification of various issues related to the Guidelines (e.g. WESSAS, putting the application information on Wisenet, etc.).

Program staff within the Department were able to review these recommendations and developed the following guiding principles in terms of incorporating them into the FY 96 Application Guidelines.

1. To the maximum extent possible, do not incorporate any additional information requirements;
2. Given that Carl Perkins is up for reauthorization and the FY 96 Application Guidelines being developed cover the last year of the current Act, minimize changes this year and include more substantial changes once a new Act takes effect;
3. Eliminate all things which are not specifically required by the Act; and
4. Those recommendations not used in FY 96 will be saved for future use either through another review session or in subsequent Guidelines.

Related Issues Team

This group discussed the three issues identified for them and developed core ideas and principles for each as well as the following types of recommendations:

LVEC Requirement - Six recommendations based on maintaining the requirement and expanding its role in inservice and leadership.

Consortium Fiscal Practices - Three recommendations regarding the Department's responsibility to clearly communicate what needs to occur as well as what should not occur.

DPI Consultant Role - Two recommendations related to how consultant staff could improve their communications with the field and a request that local projects be allowed to change consultants based on justification.

Six additional comments/suggestions were made on such other issues as DPI training of LVECs, January Application Workshops, Coordination with the School to Work Office and Title III-E Tech Prep projects.

VEERS System

Much of the early morning session in this group was spent discussing the federal requirements necessitating this system and the specifics of what the system can and cannot do. The latter morning session was spent dealing with the broad topic of DPI communication/inservicing on VEERS and identified four major areas (with specific suggestions under each) related to this.

1. Clarification of Definitions, Descriptions and Ideas;
2. Technical Assistance Needs;
3. Communication Between DPI, Fiscal Agents and LEAs; and
4. Multiple Requests for Related Data.

Workshop Evaluation

Nineteen of the twenty-one local staff provided written feedback on Evaluation Forms. The most positive aspect of the experience came back as the simple opportunity to participate and learn with DPI staff. (This was shared by DPI staff who participated.) In terms of suggested changes to the Workshop design, most commentors liked the design used yet wanted additional "types" of people involved on an annual basis. In terms of Other Suggestions, Concerns or Comments, nineteen different statements were provided. Of these, five suggested doing this in some sort of ongoing basis and several made comments regarding DPI's followup to the event. Additional ideas related to the types and quantity of issues to include in future similar workshops were also provided.

All in all, local staff appreciated the experience but were most clear that lack of DPI followup and/or implementation of the recommendations would have significant, negative consequences.

State of Wisconsin
Department of Public Instruction
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 7841, Madison, WI 53707-7841
125 South Webster Street, Madison, WI 53702 (608) 266-3390/(608) 267-2427 TDD

John T. Benson
State Superintendent

Robert H. Gomoll
Deputy State Superinten

DATE: August 22, 1994

TO: CESA Administrators and David Carlson

FROM: Eunice Bethke, Leader
Instructional Strategies Mission Team

SUBJECT: Designating CESA Staff to Assist in Revising Carl Perkins Practices

Thank you for the opportunity to discuss various federal vocational education act issues with you last Friday and a planned review of selected Department practices centering on the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act. As you know doubt recall, we are organizing a peer review process by which to assess and make recommendations for change in those practices during the first two weeks of October. Specifically, we are hoping to obtain the services of a representative from each CESA to participate in this effort.

In order to facilitate our organizational planning for this activity, we would appreciate learning who will be the representative from your CESA so we may start the information flow to participants. Please take a few minutes to decide who will represent your CESA and submit the information requested below by 9/2/94. Should you prefer to call, please contact either Bob Enghagen (608) 267-2275 or Marlene Klug (608) 266-3922 of my staff.

Thank you for your cooperation in assisting the Department to do a better job.

Reviewing/Revising DPI Carl Perkins Practices

CESA Designee Name/Position:_____

Address: _____

Phone #:_____ FAX #:_____

cc: Pauli Nikolay, Assistant State Superintendent
Division for Learning Support - Instructional Services

State of Wisconsin
Department of Public Instruction
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 7841, Madison, WI 53707-7841
125 South Webster Street, Madison, WI 53702 (608) 266-3390/(608) 267-2427 TDD

John T. Benson
State Superintendent

Robert H. Gomoll
Deputy State Superinten

DATE: September 9, 1994

TO: CESA, 66.30 and LEA Carl Perkins Representatives

FROM: Bob Enghagen, Education Specialist
Instructional Strategies Mission Team

SUBJECT: October Carl Perkins Workshop

First of all, "Thank You" for agreeing/volunteering to participate in the upcoming workshop to review the Department's program implementation practices related to the Carl Perkins Act (CPA). The basics are as follows:

Dates: October 6th and 7th, 1994

Location: Quality Inn - South, Madison Wisconsin (map enclosed)

A draft Agenda and Participant Roster are enclosed. The Department will provide for lodging Thursday night at the Quality Inn and all meals. Claim forms for mileage reimbursement will be distributed at the end of the workshop.

After the Thursday night dinner, department staff will review the requirements of the federal act and how those requirements are translated into DPI policy and practice. Given the concerns raised by various people from the field, the group will then be divided into three smaller groups for the Friday a.m. breakouts. Two components of the total Carl Perkins "system" (the Application Guidelines and the VEERS system), will have their own sub-group and the third will focus on other issues related to state and local implementation of the Act. (Should any of you have some specific ideas you would like discussed in this sectional, please forward them to me at the Department.) Copies of agency documents related to the Act will be available at the workshop.

You are encouraged to solicit ideas, concerns, issues, etc. related to this workshop from other Carl Perkins eligible recipients. Should you find yourself unable to attend, please contact me at (608) 267-2275 as soon as possible so a replacement can be found.

See you October 6th!

BE:rje

Workshop Agenda and Participant List

Agenda
Local Practitioner Review of DPI Carl Perkins Practices
October 6-7, 1994
Quality Inn - South, Madison

October 6, 1994

6 p.m.	Dinner
7 p.m.	Overview of Carl Perkins Requirements and the DPI system
8 p.m.	Questions and Answers
8:30 p.m.	Structure of Next Day's Workshop Activities

October 7, 1994

7:45 a.m.	Continental Breakfast
8:30 a.m.	Breakout Sessions •Application Guidelines •VEERS •Related Implementation Issues
10:00 a.m.	Break
10:15 a.m.	Breakouts Continue
Noon	Lunch
12:45 p.m.	Groups Report Out to Large Group
2:15 p.m.	Break
2:30 p.m.	Wrap-up/Evaluation
3:00 p.m.	Adjourn

Revising DPI Carl Perkins Practices Work Session
Participant Roster

Date: Dinner and Evening pre-session on Thursday, October 6 beginning at 6:00 p.m. 7:45 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Friday, October 7th.

Participants:

Large Schools

*Cyndy Sandberg, Watertown
*Fred Skebba, Rhinelander
*La Vonne Sorenson, Beloit
*Gary Leonard, Wausau
*Eric Peli, MPS

DPI Staff

*Pauli Nikolay
*Eunice Bethke
*Marlene Klug
*Bob Enghagen
*Barb Schuler
*Don Vedder
*Joan Loock
*Connie Colussy
*Marie Burbach
*Elaine Staaland

66.30's

*Peter Smet, Burlington
*Dan Reis, Hudson
•Tina Cipriano, Gateway Technical College
*Ken Sedbrook, Monroe
*Marv Paulson, Plymouth

CESA Representatives

1. Kathy Eidsmoe*
2. Cindy Vaughn*
3. Heidi Linden*
4. Le Roy Raddatz*
5. Pamela Hillesheim-Setz*
6. Tom Koch*
7. Jim Kreuger*
8. Brenda Russell•
9. Steve Kain*
10. Linda Cate Dunahee*
11. Nancy Graese*
12. Dennis Cairns*

* = Confirmed • = Invited

ED 378 396

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Doyle

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE068061

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Breakout Teams: Direction, Topics and Roster

Team Rosters and General Directions

The overall approach for the Breakout Sessions is to serve as "Listen & Learn" sessions for the Department in terms of this particular federal program. The basic format for the Friday morning breakouts is to use the first session to generate issues, concerns, etc. The attached sheets indicate some core issues which have been previously identified and are to be used to initiate discussion. The basic format for the second morning session will be to focus on the issues previously identified in a problem-solving modality to come up with some suggested solutions. Department staff will serve as facilitators and notetakers for these sessions. Each breakout team is asked to designate one local representative as spokesperson for the Friday afternoon feedback session.

Teams for the Friday morning Breakout Sessions were developed to achieve a mixture of CESA, 66.30 and single district projects. In addition, male/female ratios, years of experience, and geographic location were all taken into account in developing the teams. The following assignments indicate where each of you has been placed. Should you have a significant concern which will not be addressed by the team to which you are assigned, please contact the respective DPI staff for the team to inform them of that issue and they will incorporate into their team's discussions. The following chart details the team assignments.

Application Guidelines	Related Issues	VEERS
Pamela Hillesheim-Setz	Dennis Cairns*	Linda Dunahee*
Steve Kain	Tina Cipriano	Nancy Graese
Heidi Linden	Kathy Eidsmoe	Tom Koch
Marv Paulson	Gary Leonard	Jim Kreuger
Le Roy Raddatz	Eric Peli	Dan Reis
Peter Smet	Ken Sedbrook	Cyndy Sandberg
La Vonne Sorenson	Cindy Vaughn	Fred Skebba
	(*switched teams)	
DPI Staff: Marie Burbach and Marlene Klug	DPI Staff: Joni Loock and Connie Colussy	DPI Staff: Elaine Staaland, Barb Schuler and Don Vedder

Summaries of the data gathered through these proceedings will be compiled and used as base data in revising DPI practices for the upcoming FY 96 funding cycle. A Summary Report will also be developed describing the recommendations and DPI action on them. This will be mailed out to all the Workshop participants.

Review of DPI Carl Perkins Practices
Breakout Session Questions - Application Guidelines
Friday, October 7, 1994

8:30 - 10:00 a.m. Session

- Walk through of the FY 95 Guidelines indicating the areas required by the Act, the Regs or the State Plan.

- Comments have been received indicating the Guidelines are redundant, that sections are repeated, often verbatim, in different parts of the full package.

- Comments have been received indicating the Guidelines are not user-friendly, that they are not listed in a logical, sequential order and that they are confusing. Under Carl Perkins I, an outline was provided for the Local Plan portion of the Plan and the separate applications were subsequently developed based on that Plan. Was that means of communicating the application requirements clearer?

- Staff within the Department have noted that there are two sets of information regarding documentation of activities involving individuals who are members of special populations. Has this presented a problem?

- What other issues need to be discussed in order to make the Guidelines clearer?

10:15 - Noon Session

- From the list of issues, ideas, etc. generated in the earlier session, how can the Department revise the Guidelines to make them more user friendly?

Review of DPI Carl Perkins Practices
Breakout Session Questions - Related Issues
Friday, October 7, 1994

8:30 - 10:00 a.m. Session

- The LVEC/vocational designee requirement is the only state-imposed requirement for districts seeking to access this federal funding. How is this working?

- Districts no longer receive entitlements through Carl Perkins and most are required to be members of consortiums since their allocation is below the $15,000 federal minimum. Fiscal agent districts/CESAs bear significant responsibility to document size, scope and quality as it relates to consortium activities paid for with federal funds. Department staff are very concerned about consortium participants, fiscal agent responsibilities and the flow of federal funds.

- The Department realigned the vocational discipline consultants into teams based on VTAE districts over four years ago. Districts participating in the Act had one staff person assigned as primary and another as secondary contact in terms of the Perkins applications. How has this worked?

- Are there other issues related to Department practices and Carl Perkins which merit discussion?

10:15 - Noon Session

- From the discussion related to all issues identified, how can the Department do better?

Review of DPI Carl Perkins Practices
Breakout Session Questions - VEERS
Friday, October 7, 1994

8:30 - 10:00 a.m. Session

- At the time the VEERS system was implemented, the intent was to build on expected requirements of the statewide pupil accounting system. As of today, the now-named Student Reporting System will not be implemented for at least another two years and it will not be able to provide the information we need. Therefore, we expect to continue VEERS for the foreseeable future. In addition, demands for more discrete data at the national, but mostly the state levels, are increasing.

- Comments have been received that the VEERS system is cumbersome and that it takes too much time to do. Let's begin the discussion with these points.

- In the past, the Department used to provide training sessions on the student data system. Would such technical assistance be of benefit?

- How should the Department deal with requests for more discrete VEERS data? Several of these requests are coming from the voc ed community at different levels (e.g. VTAE, W/COVE, UW-CEW, etc.).

- What other issues need to be discussed in order to make the VEERS system more effective and useful at all levels?

10:15 - Noon Session

- From the list of issues, ideas, etc. generated in the earlier session, how can the Department improve VEERS?

Breakout Team Recommendations: Application Guidelines, Related Issues and VEERS

CPA Application Guidelines Recommendations

NOTE: The following list of suggestions was generated in the Application Guidelines Breakout Group and are written as per their worksheets from the Reporting Out Session. Peter Smet from the Burlington schools served as the reporter.

- Mailing list duplicative (too many books to one LVEC - VE, SP, etc.)
- While the volume of the Guidelines has increased, the $ is less.
- Weed out some things
- Tech Prep Guidelines (limit space for response more like Tech Prep)
- Separate application from guidelines
- Sign-offs required? Coordination is a problem; Signatures on file at LEA/CESA; Hassle to followup
- School Board Signatures required? Usually a draft at best.
- Application Workshops: 2C in AM, Competitive in PM
- 6 weeks for re-write OK but need 8 weeks minimum for new
- Role of PIC - Inservice DILHR/Quarterly PIC meetings/Agenda
- Federal requirements---State Policy---local policy/implementation (What is a Federal requirement? Clarify in application)
- Workshops in December. (February heavy staff development time)
- 3-E deadline same as 2-C, etc.
- Practitioner Review
- Community Profile: where do you draw the line?
- More fill in the blank (where possible). Separate criteria to accomplish this (ensures same message being given)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

•If in VEERS, don't repeat in application--timing?

•Identify possible sources of information

•Evaluation is no longer tied to what is going on 2 years later?

•9th grade where funding starts?

•Why TPLG signature, why? Require secondary TPLG representative on 3-E project

•To coordinate 2-C & 3-E money, TPLG rep part of grant writing team

•PIC signature: If access $$, OK; if not, don't require

•Definition of terms on Charts A & B; sample measurable student outcomes; samples, inservice

•Definition of local amount budgeted

•Statement of Need, Objectives, Evaluation Plan, Operational Plan maybe a chart format, sample, check-off, etc.

•WESSAS inservice needed/WESSAS codes available

•If items are not going to be funded, let the guidelines reflect this decision (competitive grants)

•CBOs: more information needed

•Sharing of information on projects: Wisnet; application on disk

Related Issues Recommendations

NOTE: The following list of suggestions was generated in the Application Guidelines Breakout Group and are written as per their worksheets from the Reporting Out Session. Kathy Eidsmoe from CESA #1 served as the reporter.

<u>LVEC Requirement</u> - (* equals Recommendations)

•Vocational or School to Work philosophy essential

•If no requirement, districts will "umbrella" it under something else

•Need both LVEC and "the commitment"

•LVEC is tied into vocational education networks

•LVEC at consortium level (Disadvantage: local district may not have the expertise)

•LVEC coursework is not always relevant to real job

•Leadership/management qualities are essential; **curriculum** background is very important. LVEC is curriculum specialist for vocational education.

*Consortium LVECs need to inservice their local LVECs/designees

*WASVA take a more active role in disseminating information to LVECs

*LVECs need to take a stronger leadership role in district(s)/consortium

*LVEC certification: Modify coursework and provide internship; link with other study groups

*District designee have a vocational license or better ("vocational commitment")

*Keep LVEC requirement in Carl Perkins

*Consider changing LVEC name; certification requirements maintain/modify (school to work is a good **current** umbrella name)

Consortiums: How are they working for individual participants?

•75% of districts are small. Many have no business/industry in their community

•Elements of the Consortium Arrangement

-Equipment Purchases (If all schools agree to locate the equipment in the school with the "greatest need")

-Equity Issues: Some are $14,999 and some are $3,000

-Local Autonomy for decisions related to grant

-Consortium must agree on how the $ is apportioned to various districts (Law)

-Leadership and Balance of Power

66.30	vs.	CESA Consortium
Disadvantage: Possible uneven balance of power (personal power)		Advantage: CESA LVEC can provide leadership for consensus building)

*Guideline: "When you join a consortium you lose your **fiscal** identity, not your priority identity"

*Partners must develop plan together. Consensus on outcomes. (Resource distribution cannot be based on LEAs proportional contribution. Resource distribution must be based on consortium goals and objectives and local needs.)

*DPI--Clearly communicate this in Application Guidelines that they are in **jeopardy of loss of funds or paying $ back** (DPI Monitoring--may need different form; needs exploration???) *[Ed. note: This refers to consortiums viewing and budgeting as if the individual district allocations are to be administered as entitlements back to local districts. Such practice is illegal and sets up fiscal agents for serious potential problems with audits and disallowed costs .]*

DPI Consultant Role

•Primary/secondary DPI consultant

DPI Consultants are not consistent in their interpretations (DILHR also)
Except equipment purchases and Youth Apprenticeship [*Ed. note: it is unclear if the thought is that consultants are consistent in terms of equipment and Youth Apprenticeship or not]*

Generally, like having one consultant to deal with

Might like to choose their consultant

Effect of restructuring and no vocational education bureau on consultant ability to do consistent responses of providing technical assistance to field on Carl Perkins

•Consultants are good about timely responses. In general, doing a good job in spite of being spread so thin.

*DPI Consultants need to give consistent interpretation
Must meet regularly to discuss and reach consensus (A Manual, in writing with running record)

Need training - same

Bring hard questions to group

*Would like the option of changing consultants in you have a *great* difficulty; Must have a *good* reason.

*Consultants should hold face-to-face meeting with all the Carl Perkins district and consortium representatives

Other Issues

•No training for LVECs which DPI used to do

•Districts are asked for input into tech college (Title III) projects, but they do not provide assistance to LEAs. Do not think it's fair that tech college should approve (?) their grants but LEAs don't approve tech college grants

*Roadshows: **All** consultants should be at every one (related to consistency) 2 Roadshows with all: 1 full day in North and 1 full day in South

*School to Work Office involvement/dovetailing in Carl Perkins

*DPI should re-activate LVEC training (preservice and inservice)

*Work towards greater coordination between WTCS (Title III) and Title II-C: Guidelines, distribution of information and timelines

*Provide a copy, upon request, of the grant application to PICs and postsecondary but do not require their signatures (state or federal requirement?)

*Title III-E Tech Prep Projects

We question some of the spending of Title III-E funds (e.g. food at meetings or introducing new staff, etc.)

Doesn't always seem that $ is spent on secondary (used to pay for subs, not now)

How to they support secondary directly?

VEERS (Vocational Education Enrollment Reporting System)
Recommendations

NOTE: The following list of suggestions and ideas was generated in the VEERS Breakout Group and are written as per their worksheets from the Reporting Out Session. Dan Reis from the Hudson schools and Nancy Graese from CESA #11 served as co-reporters.

Issue: Clarification of the following definitions, descriptions, and ideas

- Characteristic codes
- Instructional area codes
- Work based
- Support services
- Voc Ed courses (applied courses, too?)
- Completion status

Issue: Technical Assistance Needs

- LVECs and designees overall
- Systematic (definitions, overall picture)
- Use of results

Issue: Communication between DPI, Fiscal Agents, LEAs

- When reports are in or missing
- Who receives reports
- Written communication and followup assistance

Issue: Multiple Requests for Related Data

- Carl Perkins IIC and IIIE
- Pupil accounting
- Outside Agencies (WTCS, W/COVE, UW-CEW, Advocacy groups, UW)
- Multiple Communications to LEAs (LVEC, E4E, District Administrator Principal)
- Clarification of State and Federal Requirements
- Individual WTCS district requests vary

Workshop Evaluation Form and Comments

Evaluation Form
Reviewing DPI Carl Perkins Practices
October, 1994

1. What about this experience was most meaningful?

2. What about this workshop should be changed?

3. Other comments, concerns or suggestions.

Summary of Evaluation Form Comments

Most Meaningful Aspect of the Workshop

The opportunity to hear DPI explain Fed regs and other reasons why things are done.

The opportunity to have some input in changes that may make things more streamlined.

Exchange of ideas.

Open sharing of information and receptive atmosphere.

Develop a better understanding of these issues.

Valuable networking with LVEC and staff folk.

Input from many sources.

Openness and cooperation of group facilitators.

Opportunity to provide meaningful input.

Small groups provided greater opportunity for real generation of ideas rather than filibustering sessions!

Just having the opportunity to sit down all together. In four years I've never had an opportunity to do this before--excellent discussions!

The cooperative spirit of both DPI and LVECs.

I really appreciate the opportunity to share my concerns about the CPA.

Good exchange of dialogue between DPI and field.

DPI staff open to discussion and listened well.

Being able to voice my frustrations and understand why something is being done the way it is. This was great.

Sharing of ideas and being able to provide input to problems and concerns that were identified. Great exchange!

Communication. Open and honesty. Real professional.

Exchange of experiences at LEA level to direct legislation reauthorization.

Consultants able to hear about "real life" experiences and practices.

Nice to have input into something that effects us so greatly.

Coming together with voc ed people having some common goals.

Opportunity for input on secondary vocational education/School to Work

Interaction amongst LVECs and DPI.

Hearing and seeing "the rest of the story" in regard to what the Federal Regs are.

It was interesting to hear that other LVECs were having similar problems with the system.

The opportunity for free and open input.

I learned a lot about the Federal Requirements. And I enjoyed the exchange of ideas. (This has been a very good experience.)

Suggestions for Change in the Workshop

Nothing - it was a good set up! I'm glad I could come.

Need this to be done again.

Evening session was a bit too hurried. I appreciate the purpose - but perhaps a different strategy (or slower) for accomplishing could have been employed.

An opportunity to make written comments/suggestions that one can get answered but without identifying yourself.

Schedule annually.

Consider that what may be a problem for DPI staff (e.g. facing the PIC Board) is not always well received if LEAs then must take the "heat" at the local level instead of DPI taking "heat" at the top.

Nothing - I really liked the format.

Involve other agencies such as the School-to-Work, DILHR, VTAE reps.

Keep up good format.

It was run very well.

Would be great to have someone enter information into a laptop computer while it being generated.

Should be at least once a year.

I would have liked the LVECs to lead the agenda and the DPI to be the "targets".

I like the format.

We could expand (this group) - or break the subject down into more parts. I don't know - I did enjoy the whole time.

Other Suggestions, Concerns or Comments

We need this type of forum every year or every other year.

I'd like to see a mentor or training program for new LVECs. (This did help.)

Very good.

Thank you for providing the workshop. I believe it was very beneficial.

Are concerns for competitive grants the same as (or similar to) those for 2C? this focused a great deal on IIC. (This is not a complaint - more an observation.)

Will those who participated received receive some followup info as to how our input was used? It would be a great affirmation that our input was/is valued.

Do this again.

Must establish linkages between DPI and our school districts through CESA-wide meetings with DPI consultants. Direct communications solves many problems.

Keep it up.

Not implementing these thoughts will be a sure fine way to cut into DPI respectability.

Good idea. Continue as much as possible. As CPA reauthorization develops you may want to and should bring in field staff to help provide input into applications, followup, etc.

Please try to really look at our concerns and try to respond.

Please try to be consistent on information coming out of DPI on regulations. One area is applied classes funding and counting of those as vocational classes.

This should be continued in some way.

Great!!

Please followup with a summary of these developments (charts with ideas). Would be nice to receive a copy.

I thought the review went well and all present had a chance to express views.

No assurance that something would be done with suggestions given.

I look forward for the printed summary of the 3 groups' input. Thanks for asking me to be part of all this.

NOTES